

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings incorporate the changes from the corrected drawings submitted with the May 28, 2004 Amendment and replace the original sheets including Figs. 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets Figs. 1-2

**REMARKS**

Claims 21-27, 30, 32-34, 36-40 and 42-49 are pending. By this Amendment, Figs. 1 and 2 are replaced pursuant to the attached drawing sheets, and claims 30, 34, 40, 46 and 47 are amended to recite features supported in the specification on page 18, lines 12-24 and Figs. 8-9. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Final Office Action indicates that claims 21-27 and 49 are allowed. The Examiner is also thanked for withdrawing the earlier rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. However, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 30, 32-34, 36-40 and 42-48 are also allowable for the reasons provided below.

Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**I. Amendment Entry after Final Rejection**

Entry of this amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: a) place the application in condition for allowance for all the reasons discussed herein; b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration; c) place the application in better condition for appeal if necessary; and d) address formal requirements of the Final Rejection and preceding Office Action.

The foregoing amendments do not raise any new issues after Final Rejection. Therefore, entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

**II. References are Properly Disclosed**

An Information Disclosure Statement along with form PTO-1449 is attached to this Amendment. The Information Disclosure Statement submits references cited in a foreign search report for the Examiner's consideration and formally making these references of record.

### III. Claims 30, 32-34, 36-40 and 42-48 Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Final Office Action rejects claims 30, 34 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,185,712 to Sato *et al.* (hereinafter “Sato”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,144,203 to Fujita *et al.* (hereinafter “Fujita”); claims 32, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43 and 45-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sato in view of Fujita and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,507,745 to Forrest *et al.* (hereinafter “Forrest”); and claims 33, 38 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sato in view of Fujita and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,091,382 to Shioya *et al.* (hereinafter “Shioya”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Sato and Fujita, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a display device having at least a light source including an organic electroluminescent element, a liquid crystal display element illuminated by the light source, and an optical system that includes a holographic combiner and that enlarges and displays an image displayed in the display element, as recited in claim 30, and similarly recited in claims 34 and 40, 46.

Instead, Sato discloses a viewfinder 10 having a liquid crystal display panel 12 with adjacently mounted display sections 13R, 13G, 13B and reflecting mirrors 17, 18, 19 to reflect light from the display sections to an eyepiece 16 through a mirror barrel 15 (col. 3, lines 28-42, col. 4, lines 26-36 and Fig. 2 of Sato).

Further, Fujita discloses a circuit for an electroluminescence lamp. In particular, Fujita teaches a DC-DC converter 100 with a switching pulse generating circuit 100, a peak current detecting circuit 102, a field transistor 103 a resistor 104, a transformer 105 at the primary winding to the input terminal, rectifying diodes 106, 107 and capacitors 108, 109 (col. 5, lines 47-66 and Fig. 7 of Fujita).

Also, Sato, Fujita and Forrest, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a display device having at least a light source comprising a plurality of organic electroluminescent elements arrayed on the same substrate, the plurality of organic

electroluminescent elements emitting light simultaneously, a liquid crystal display element illuminated by the light source, and an optical system that includes a holographic combiner and that enlarges and displays an image displayed in the display element, as recited in claim 46 and similarly recited in claim 47 for a display device having first, second and third light sources.

Additionally, Forrest and Shioya do not compensate for the deficiencies of Sato and Fujita outlined above for claims 30, 34 and 40. Nor does Forrest teach, disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 32, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43, 45 and 48 or Shioya teach, disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 33, 38 and 44.

Instead, Forrest discloses vertically stacked layers of double heterostructure light emitting diodes (LEDs) 20, 21, 22 on a glass substrate 37. In particular, Forrest teaches such devices, *e.g.*, LED 20 as consisting of an HTL layer 20H disposed on an ITO layer 35, with an EL layer 20E sandwiched between a top ETL layer 20T and the HTL layer 20H. These LEDs are superposed one above the other (col. 4, lines 4-25, col. 5, lines 4-18 and Figs. 2A-2C and 14A of Forrest). Thus, Forrest teaches away from Applicants' claimed features regarding elements in a common plane of a substrate support surface.

Further, Shioya discloses the low pixel cross-talk display, as discussed above for claim 24. In particular, Shioya teaches consecutive drive voltage pulses according to element color (col. 13, lines 11-24 of Shioya). As discussed above, Applicants' claimed features provide for electric current applied in a simultaneous pulse mode for the electrodes, which Shioya fails to teach or suggest.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejected independent claims are now patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed as well as for the

additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gerhard W. Thielman  
Registration No. 43,186

JAO:GWT/gwt

**Attachments:**

Replacement Drawing Sheets Figs. 1-2  
Information Disclosure Statement with PTO-1449

Date: December 3, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---